

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 53-77 remain pending in this application with claims 53-59 being withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 60, 67, 73 and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,246,981 (“Papineni”). In response, Applicants traverse the rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Applicants rely on M.P.E.P. § 2131, entitled “Anticipation – Application of 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e)” which states, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Papineni does not describe each and every element of the claims.

Independent claim 60 is directed to a “method of processing information” comprising in addition to other steps “adding the additional information to the inputted text with a change processing device; and outputting the inputted text to which the information is added with an information reproducing device” (emphasis added). Independent claims 67, 73, 74, 75, 76 and 77 recite similar limitations.

In contrast, Papineni does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every element recited in independent claims 60, 67, 73 and 74.

Papineni discloses a natural language task-oriented dialog manager and a system for conversant interaction (see Abstract and column 3, lines 8 to 19). Further, column 15 of Papineni discloses a dialogue between a human and a computer.

However, Papineni does not disclose or suggest the operation of adding the additional information to the inputted text. Particularly, the system of Papineni responds to inputted

text, but does not add any additional information to the inputted text. In Papineni, the computer responses to the human input (e.g., Please Say Yes or No) is not added to any inputted text, but rather are provided to the human so that the human can respond to the computer, in order to complete a stock transaction. The Final Office Action asserts that column 15 discloses the claimed limitations. Applicants disagree.

Papineni discloses that the human inputs “I want to buy one hundred shares” which is a sentence classified as a declaration. The computer further gathers information related to the fund (fund name from context) and restates it as a declaration back to the person and, in addition, adds a confirmation (an additional category) which is related to the type of sentence (declaration).” However, Papineni teaches that the computer responds “confirming purchase of one hundred shares of vanguard index trust total stock market institutional shares. Please say yes or no (fund name from context)” to “I want to buy one hundred shares” of the human statement (see column 15, lines 25 to 29). That is, Papineni doesn't disclose that the additional information is added to the input information “I want to buy one hundred shares.” In contrast, in the claimed method, for example, the additional information “Do you hear it?” is added to “I want to buy one hundred shares” and the inputted text to which the information is added is “I want to buy one hundred shares. Do you hear it?” However, this implementation is not disclosed by Papineni.

M.P.E.P. § 2131 states that “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *See In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Here, Papineni fails to disclose each and every limitation in as complete detail as is contained in independent claims 60, 67, 73 and 74.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and independent claims 60, 67, 73 and 74 be allowed. Further, claims 61-66 and 68-72 depend from one of claims 60 or 67 and should be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above without regard to further patentable limitations contained therein.

If this rejection of the claims is maintained, the examiner is respectfully requested to point out where the above-mentioned features are disclosed in Papineni.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 60-64, 66-70 and 72-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,773,344 (“Gabai”) in view of Papineni. Claims 65 and 71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Gabai in view of Papineni and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,513,011 (“Uwakubo”). In response, Applicants traverse the rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Gabai is directed toward a method for use in an interactive toy. Gabai discloses a toy that can read inputted text, translate it and explain the cultural significance of the text. *See* Col. 43, lines 20-34. However, Gabai fails to disclose “adding the additional information to the inputted text” and “outputting the inputted text to which the information is added” as required, for example, by independent claim 60. Gabai discloses that the toy outputs a translation of the inputted text with “other types of content.” A text translation (translation of the inputted text) is not the same as the inputted text. Accordingly, Gabai fails to disclose, teach or suggest that the additional information is added to the inputted text as required by the independent claims. Instead, Gabai discloses using other types of content in conjunction with a generated translation. Further, Papineni and Uwakubo fail to cure the deficiencies of Gabai.

Claims 76 and 77

Claims 76 and 77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Papineni in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,584 (“McAllister”). As set forth above, Papineni fails to disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claims 76 and 77. Further, McAllister fails to cure the deficiencies of Papineni. For example, McAllister discloses that “[a] processor responds to both the input signal for selecting one of the groups of content equivalent messages and to a pseudorandom number for selecting one of the voice messages within the selected group” and “[a] speech output device provides an audio signal corresponding to the selected voice message stored in the memory” (see page 2, lines 47 to 52). That is, McAllister discloses a pseudorandom number for selecting one of the voice

messages and that an audio signal corresponding to the selected voice message is outputted. However, McAllister doesn't disclose that the additional information is added to the inputted text as required by independent claims 76 and 77. Accordingly, applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

When determining whether a claim is obvious, an examiner must make “a searching comparison of the claimed invention – *including all its limitations* – with the teaching of the prior art.” *In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (emphasis added). Thus, “obviousness requires a suggestion of all limitations in a claim.” *CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Intern. Corp.*, 349 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (citing *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974)). Here, the cited references fail to disclose each and every limitation in as complete detail as is contained in independent claims 60, 67, 73, 74, 75, 76 and 77.

Claims 61-66 and 68-72 depend from one of claims 60 or 67 and should also be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above without regard to further patentable limitations contained therein.

If this rejection of the claims is maintained, the examiner is respectfully requested to point out where the above-mentioned features are disclosed in the cited references.

Conclusion


Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 5/4/2011

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,072